

Local RESTORE Council  
November 14, 2013  
Milton, Florida

Present: Chairman Lane Lynchard, members Shon Owens, Brian Watkins, Buzz Eddy, Tony Alexander, Greg Fountain, Dave Robau, Cal Bodenstein, and Rob Williamson. Bob Cole and Donna Tucker were absent. Also present were the County Administrator (Hunter Walker), County Attorney (Angela Jones), and County Engineer (Roger Blaylock). Lynchard called the meeting to order at approximately 3:00 p.m.

Lynchard moved approval without objection of the October 14, 2013 meeting minutes.

Update on NRDA (Natural Resource Damage Assessment), RESTORE, and Pensacola Watershed Meeting

Jeff Helms (Atkins North America, Inc.) gave a power point presentation to the Council (Attachment in file). He said a Louisiana senator is proposing a bill to un-sequester the sequestered RESTORE funds. Helms said Santa Rosa County hosted the recent Pensacola Bay Watershed meeting. He said some of the goals mentioned at this meeting were to identify the most pressing environmental issues for the watershed, create a watershed plan, prioritize the projects for potential RESTORE and National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) funding, and to increase the coordination between all parties involved. Helms said there was a Gulf Consortium meeting held yesterday in Daytona. He said at this meeting, the scope and RFP (Request for Proposal) for the hiring process of a consultant was discussed. Helms said the Gulf Consortium will hold a visioning meeting on January 23, 2014 in Tallahassee. He said he has been asked to speak at next week's Bay Area Council Technical Advisory Committee (BARC) meeting, to give an update on Santa Rosa County's participation on the watershed.

Helms further discussed the Transocean Civil Partial Settlement. He said \$3.3 million could be available to Santa Rosa County by the end of 2015. Helms said in order to receive this money Santa Rosa County will have to complete a multi-year plan, submit the plan to the Department of Treasury for approval and then request a federal grant.

Formal Comments-Department of Treasury Rules

Helms said Jones has submitted comments and questions, on behalf of Santa Rosa County, regarding the Department of Treasury rules. He said the comments and questions will be posted on the County's RESTORE webpage.

Economic Development

Ogletree discussed the economic development criteria ranking and associated weight of each criteria (Attachment in file).

Robau said it is not uncommon for projects to take 3 or 4 years. He asked if a larger project will get penalized because it may be a more complex project. Robau said he feels if the Council is investing a RESTORE dollar, and a project is multiplying that dollar, its weight should be increased. Ogletree said leveraging will be seen on (ROI) Return of Investment. Helms said if a project is not ready to create jobs within three years, the company may need to bring its project back another year.

Lynchard said an important aspect of RESTORE is to encourage putting the money to work sooner, rather than later, in the revitalization of our local economy. He said he agrees with Robau that projects which will be leveraging other funds should receive more points.

There was further discussion regarding the assigned points of each economic development criteria.

Eddy said he agrees that more points should be given for return on investment. He said he feels benefit should be given to a new industry, not just someone who comes into the County and displaces jobs that already exist. Ogletree said the Council may want to add diversification back into the criteria. Lynchard said he feels diversification of local economy should be added as an

additional component to the following criteria: “program needed to support industry recruitment of expansion”. There was further discussion of the criteria and reassigning of points.

Williamson asked Ogletree if he agrees that talent is the number one issue in which industries look for when relocating to another area. Ogletree said yes. He said educators are linking education and economic development closer together. Williamson said the Board of County Commission is responsible for the economic development budget and the school district is responsible for the workforce development budget. He said he feels the RESTORE Council has an opportunity to help bridge the gap to help with workforce development. He said he feels Santa Rosa County could be a leader in economic development if the County had a better focus on workforce development programs. Helms said this may be an opportunity for Escambia and Santa Rosa County to partner together to work on something through Pensacola State College. There was further discussion on workforce training.

Robau said he suggest making Santa Rosa Economic Development Office support a prerequisite, instead of a criteria. He said he does not see a need in evaluating a project if it is counter to what the economic development office would support.

After further discussion of rearranging the criteria and points distribution, the following results were proposed:

- Return on Investment (Pay an average wage that is at least 100 percent of the average county wage rate; and number of net new, private sector, full-time equivalent jobs) - 30 points.
- Will the project or program leverage other funds - 20 points
- Jobs created in 3 years or less - 5 points.
- Annual payroll after full job creation - 10 points
- Program needed to support industry recruitment, expansion, or diversification of local economy – 30 points.
- Economic Development Office/Public Support – 5 points

Helms said with inflation continuing to increase, his only concern would be to encourage businesses to pay more than the average county wage rate.

Lynchard said paying the average wage rate criteria could actually be a “bright line” test. Helms said in other words, this being used as a filtering mechanism. Lynchard said yes.

### Tourism

Helms discussed the tourism criteria and associated points (Attachment in file). Robau asked how one would measure public support. Helms said there will need to be some kind of a measuring scale. He said it is usually when you get opposition that you can measure the level of support. Eddy said he feels there should be recognition for projects that are going to attract tourists year after year. Lynchard said he feels this could be factored into ROI. He said sustainable projects are one of the guiding principles of the Council.

Helms asked about adding the word sustainability to “the expected magnitude of positive tourist benefits to Santa Rosa County” criteria. Lynchard said he agrees. He said sustainability would be factored into this category as well as ROI. Helms said the HAAS Center indicated that when the BP money was spent it had a significant impact on tourism. He said he will contact Dr. Lewis in order for the ROI and the metrics associated with this. He said he will bring this back to the Council for review.

Williamson said he feels the second criteria, “Does project fill a gap in existing Santa Rosa County tourism”, is very important because it is about expanding the County’s tourism season from five to twelve months. He said he would like to see public support and TDC support combined. Alexander said he agrees with Williamson. He said when adding additional weight to increase the shoulder season, there is an economic component as well.

Kristen Loera said she agrees that public support and TDC (Tourist Development Council) support should be combined. She said she feels the criteria points for this should be lowered for leverage elsewhere. Loera said she feels the Council should consider whether these projects are

putting “heads in beds” in order to develop more bed tax dollars. She said she feels clarification should be made to encourage people to stay in Santa Rosa County’s hotels and condos. Williamson asked Loera if she agrees that the top two criteria could be combined. Loera said yes. She said she agrees with a shoulder season focus.

After further discussion, Lynchard said the following changes made to the tourism criteria are:

- Public Support/TDC Support – 10 points
- Does project fill a gap in existing SRC tourism market demand or create demand in new SRC tourism markets – 15 points.

### Infrastructure

Helms gave an overview of the proposed infrastructure criteria ranking (Attachment in file).

Lynchard said he feels the first criteria could be a “bright line” test. He said if a project does not create jobs or have economic benefits, then the project should not be considered. Lynchard said these 15 points would then be available for reallocation. Blaylock said any infrastructure job is going to create short term construction crews, contracts, etc. He said this would be short-term but the legacy would be the benefits that they provided. Lynchard said ROI is also on the list. He said he feels the efficiency of maintenance criteria is very important. Lynchard said he would like to see more points given to proposals contributing to Santa Rosa County resiliency and ability to weather disasters. He said this Council is trying to complete projects which will change this County for the long term. Lynchard said he would also like to see points added to “leveraging ability”. He said these are the types of projects where this Council can stretch dollars.

Shon Owens said if a project is already to the point of permitting, he feels the Council should speed up the process. Blaylock said a project at this stage would receive an automatic 15 points.

After further discussion the following changes were made to the Infrastructure criteria:

“Does project create jobs or economic benefits for SRC” became an eligible activity and is no longer part of the criteria. These 15 points were reassigned to the following:

- Does the proposal contribute overall to SRC’s economic resilience and ability to weather disasters – 20 points
- Potential leveraging ability – 15 points

### Environment

Helms said for the benefit of the environmental criteria ranking, he would like to be consistent with the intent of the Pot 2 and Pot 3 funding as well as the overall Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council Comprehensive Plan. He said he would also like to stay consistent with the watershed and State in order to potentially leverage funds. Helms gave an overview of the goals and objectives of the Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council Comprehensive Plan (Attachment in file). He said health benefits have been added to the environmental criteria ranking list to address concerns and target some of the issues of the Navarre Park health warnings.

Robau said he feels health benefits are a big issue due to the recent beach closings. He said this also has an adverse impact on tourism. Robau said he would like to see greater emphasis placed on health benefits. He said there are a lot of people which are still dealing with health issues from the environmental impact. Robau said septic tank abatement would be a project that would have an increased health benefit.

There was further discussion of the criteria point distribution. Helms said the third category is a little redundant. Blaylock said he feels it may be possible, in the grading metric of the first two criteria, to assign a project 20 points if the project meets all environmental goals and objectives. He said if the project does not meet all goals/objective then it would not receive the entire 20 points. Lynchard said the third category could be folded into the first two categories and then take those points and add them to the health benefits criteria to make it worth 15 points.

Jessica Koelsch, National Wildlife Federation, said she feels it is important to capture the part of the third criteria which states project quality, feasibility and anticipated project outcomes. Lynchard said he feels feasibility could be folded into the fourth criteria.

After further discussion it was decided to eliminate the third environmental criteria (Attachment in file), and add the word feasible (to what is now the third category) to read:

- “To what degree of the proposed project and/or the anticipated project outcome sustainable and feasible over the long-term. – 15 points
- Health Points – 15 points

#### Other Business

Lynchard said he would like to see Helms put together a final version of the criteria for each eligible component and bring this back to the December meeting, He said the Council can take additional public input at that time and hopefully approve the ranking criteria. Helms asked if Lynchard would also like him to list performance measures for each of the criteria. Lynchard said yes. He said he would also like Helms to work towards developing an application, for each project category, so the Council can review this at the next meeting.

#### Next Meeting

Lynchard said the next meeting will be December 9, 2013 @ 3:00 p.m. at the new Tiger Point Community Center. He said this will be the first official meeting in this new facility.

#### Public Forum

Gloria Horning said she is representing the Center of Independent Living. She said at Monday’s Escambia County’s RESTORE meeting she will be presenting the ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) guidelines that should be incorporated into the project criteria. Horning said people with disabilities are the number one minority in the United States. She said the Galvez Park boat launch which was built with NRDA funds will now have to be retrofitted in order to meet ADA requirements. Horning said she would like the opportunity to present these criteria to the Council at a future meeting. Lynchard said the Council will arrange a future time for her to make the presentation.

Koelsch said she would like the Council to consider how a project might also benefit in the other categories. She said a storm water project would be a perfect example. Koelsch said there is so many crossovers and feels extra value and weight should be given to the projects that will touch upon the various sectors. She further discussed a list of projects which have received some of the first round of NFWF funding.

Carole Tebay said with the recent issues regarding seafood she is not so sure the Council should be encouraging people to eat more of it.

#### Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Council at this time, the meeting adjourned.

---

By: Lane Lynchard, Chairman